

[Translation]

**Mr. Goyer:** Mr. Speaker, I do not remember the dates, but that was certainly before the criminal action took place. I had the opportunity several times to receive documents from the RCMP on the activities of that organization, but not on plans to seize documents illegally.

[English]

**Mr. Clark:** Mr. Speaker, now that we have established that the minister was briefed and engaged himself in briefings relative to these organizations prior to the break-in, would the minister tell us, without going into detail but without omitting any central direction, what kind of direction he gave to the security forces, to any of the security forces, relative to the means they should follow and the evidence they should seek to secure concerning any of these organizations?

[Translation]

**Mr. Goyer:** Mr. Speaker, directing police operations is not the function of the Solicitor General but that of the police commissioner. Indeed, the responsibility of the police includes briefing the Solicitor General on all matters related to national security and, in this respect, the police has fulfilled its duties.

[English]

**Mr. Clark:** Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to keep having to come back to this question. What instructions did the former solicitor general give to the security forces of the RCM Police prior to the break-in?

[Translation]

**Mr. Goyer:** Mr. Speaker, I have never given illegal instructions to the police force as to the means to secure information. The means have always been legal and in line with what is allowed under the Official Secrets Act.

[English]

**Mr. Clark:** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to impose longer upon the time of the House, but would the minister commit to writing or deposit in the House of Commons, since this is a matter which is now closed, a matter that is no longer under current investigation, or would he make a formal deposition outlining all of the instructions that he gave relative to the organizations whose offices were broken into, what instructions he gave to the RCM Police or other security forces prior to the break-in? He has now admitted that he was briefed before the break-in. We want to know what he told the police forces before they broke into the premises.

[Translation]

**Mr. Goyer:** Mr. Speaker, I truly believed that the Leader of the Opposition was a responsible man. He certainly does not have the makings of a prime minister. Just the same, I certify to the House that the only instructions which have ever been issued to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police are legal ones. I shall certainly act in a responsible fashion and look into the files of the RCMP to ascertain whether I can supply additional information. I have no memory of whatever instruction may have been issued. Although I have no memory of that, I

*Privilege—Mr. Goyer*

certainly remember that there has been nothing illegal, no matter what the Leader of the Opposition may say. If he has information to the contrary, he should level specific accusations and put his seat on the line.

[English]

**Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the minister's question of privilege I too should like a minute to respond, being one of those who raised serious questions and concerns. I want to deal with three important points in the minister's statement. One concerns knowledge, the second concerns ministerial responsibility and the third concerns the very grave implications of the RCMP's behaviour which have been deeply confirmed by the minister's statement today.

Firstly, the minister claims to have had no foreknowledge of the break-in. I think no one at any point, that I am aware of anyway, has questioned his contention on that. I must now confess openly to not having the second question unequivocally resolved. I will give the minister and the House reasons for that. The Solicitor General's statement made in the House concerning the meeting of November 6 indicates that the minister was not informed about the break-in at that meeting, and the former minister has repeated this afternoon that he was not informed. I am still left with some doubt on the issue, and I should like to indicate to the minister why.

● (1530)

In a Vancouver *Sun* article on December 7, 1976 the minister is quoted. I have ascertained the accuracy from the reporter's point of view—the accuracy of his notes of direct quotations attributed to the minister at that time and printed in the Vancouver *Sun*. With reference to the minister's knowledge of the break-in after it occurred, presumably arising from discussions he had with Mr. Higgitt and others, he did not know accurately what he recalled. The article quotes the minister as saying the following:

This was four years ago and I don't remember in precise terms what happened in this particular case.

I knew about this association (the APLQ) and I know it was of interest to us because of its activities. But this is as far as I can remember.

The question the minister was responding to was: was he informed after the event about the RCMP's role in the break-in? As reported here, the minister said last December that he could not remember because it was some four years ago. He could not remember whether he was told after the event or not. Now it appears, both from the Solicitor General's statement and the minister's statement today, that since last December his memory has tightened up and now recalls with clear and unequivocal precision—

**Miss MacDonald:** Under hypnosis.

**Mr. Broadbent:** —that at the meeting of November 6 with Mr. Starnes and Mr. Higgitt he was told of the break-in. I want to be fair to everyone concerned, including the minister, and I would like also to have the truth; but it seems to me there is a pretty clear contradiction between these two asser-